

FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB

TO THE

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

---

1900.

---

WASHINGTON:  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.  
1900.

FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB

TO THE

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

1900.

---

WASHINGTON:  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.  
1900.

## COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.

### OFFICERS OF THE INSTITUTION.

*Patron.*—William McKinley, President of the United States.

*President.*—Edward Miner Gallaudet, Ph. D., LL. D.

*Secretary.*—Hon. John B. Wight.

*Treasurer.*—Lewis J. Davis, esq.

*Directors.*—Hon. Francis M. Cockrell, Senator from Missouri; Hon. Charles A. Russell, Member of Congress from Connecticut; Hon. Samuel W. T. Lanham, Member of Congress from Texas, representing the Congress of the United States; Hon. Henry L. Dawes, of Massachusetts; Hon. Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut; Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D.; Hon. John W. Foster; Hon. William L. Wilson, of Virginia; Lewis J. Davis, esq.

### FACULTY OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE.

*President and professor of moral and political science.*—Edward Miner Gallaudet, Ph. D., LL. D.

*Vice-president and professor of languages.*—Edward A. Fay, M. A., Ph. D.

*Emeritus professor of mental science and English philology.*—Samuel Porter, M. A.

*Emeritus professor of natural science and lecturer on pedagogy.*—Rev. John W. Chickering, M. A.

*Professor of history and English.*—J. Burton Hotchkiss, M. A.

*Professor of mathematics and Latin.*—Amos G. Draper, M. A.

*Professor of natural science.*—Charles R. Ely, M. A., Ph. D.

*Assistant professor of mathematics.*—Percival Hall, M. A.

*Assistant professor of natural science.*—Herbert E. Day, M. A.

*Instructor in history and Latin.*—Allan B. Fay, M. A.

*Instructor in English.*—Elizabeth Peet.

*Instructors in gymnastics.*—Albert F. Adams, B. A.; Josie Helen Dobson.

*Instructor in drawing.*—Arthur D. Bryant, B. Ph.

### DEPARTMENT OF ARTICULATION.

*Professor in charge.*—Percival Hall, M. A.

### ASSISTANTS.

*Instructor.*—Kate H. Fish.

*Normal fellows.*—Margaret Ashby Lyle, B. S., Caldwell College; Ora G. Daniels, B. A., Tufts College; E. F. Mumford, M. A., Wake Forest College; Elmer D. Read, B. A., Illinois College.

*Normal student.*—Sara Frances Small, Richmond High School, Maine.

### FACULTY OF THE KENDALL SCHOOL.

*President.*—Edward Miner Gallaudet, Ph. D., LL. D.

*Instructors.*—James Denison, M. A., Principal; Melville Ballard, M. S.; Theodore A. Kiesel, B. Ph.; Sarah H. Porter.

*Instructors in articulation.*—Emma Pope; Elizabeth Peet.

*Instructor in drawing.*—Arthur D. Bryant, B. Ph.

### DOMESTIC DEPARTMENT.

*Supervisor and disbursing agent.*—Wallace G. Fowler

*Attending physician.*—D. K. Shute, M. D.

*Matron.*—Miss Myrtle M. Ellis.

*Associate matron.*—Mrs. Amanda W. Temple.

*Master of shop.*—Isaac Allison.

*Farmer and head gardener.*—Edward Mangum

# FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

## OF THE

### COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.

---

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB,  
*Kendall Green, Washington, D. C., October 2, 1900.*

The pupils remaining in the institution July 1, 1899, numbered 118; admitted during the year, 32; since admitted, 39; total, 189. Under instruction since July 1, 1899, 120 males, 69 females. Of these, 134 have been in the college department, representing 31 States, the District of Columbia, Canada, and Ireland, and 55 in the primary department. Thirty-five of these pupils were admitted as beneficiaries from the District of Columbia under your order, and 60 were admitted to the collegiate department under the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890. A list of the names of the pupils connected with the institution since July 1, 1899, will be found appended to this report.

#### HEALTH.

General good health has prevailed during the year, with but one serious exception. In June last one of our college students was found to be suffering from an attack of appendicitis.

Through the courtesy of our attending physician, Dr. Shute, free admission was obtained for him into the Columbian University Hospital, where he was successfully operated upon by Dr. W. P. Carr. After a few weeks' skillful nursing under the kind care of Miss A. G. Odell, superintendent of the hospital, the young man was able to return to his home in Pennsylvania, and he is now pursuing his studies satisfactorily.

#### COURSES OF INSTRUCTION.

In our report of last year a detailed account of the courses of study in all the departments of the institution was given. These courses remain unchanged, and it is thought unnecessary to repeat a description of them in this report.

#### LECTURES.

As an adjunct to the regular courses of study it has been the custom for several years for the professors, instructors, normal fellows, and members of the senior class of the college to give courses of lectures

to the students and pupils during the winter. These have been as follows the past year:

#### IN THE COLLEGE.

The Philippine Question, by President Gallaudet.  
 Marriage, by Professor Fay.  
 Salem Witchcraft, by Professor Hotchkiss.  
 The Mariner's Compass—Sailing by Compass, by Professor Draper.  
 Coal and some of its Products, by Professor Ely.  
 England and the Transvaal, by Professor Hall.  
 Richelieu, by Mr. Fay.  
 Chinese Customs, by Professor Day.

#### IN THE KENDALL SCHOOL.

Adventures of Ulysses, by Mr. Denison.  
 The United States Navy in 1812, and  
 Old Colonial Manners and Customs, by Mr. Ballard.  
 King Alfred the Great, by Mr. Kiesel.  
 The Surrender of Burgoyne, by Mr. Bryant.  
 The Yellow Bird, by Mr. Dobyns.  
 Reminiscences of the Spanish-American War, by Mr. Milligan.  
 Arabian Nights, by Mr. Wheeler.  
 Flute and Violin, by Mr. Long.  
 John Gilpin's Ride, and  
 The Headless Horseman of Sleepy Hollow, by Miss Marshall.  
 The Niebelungenlied, by Miss Prager.  
 The Yellow Dwarf and the White Cat, by Miss Taylor.

#### TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.

In 1893, in compliance with a recommendation from the conference of principals, and a petition from the alumni association of this college, the purpose was announced of organizing and developing a technical department, provided the demand for such a school was made evident by the presence of a sufficient number of students desirous of pursuing technical courses of study.

This demand has not been pressed as earnestly as was expected; but within the past year special courses have been arranged for several students in floriculture, agricultural chemistry, electrical engineering, and civil engineering.

A graduate of the college of the class of 1899 has pursued a year's study as a graduate student in chemistry, to fit himself the better to take an extended training in that branch of science in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

A paper on the relations of our college to technical education, prepared by Professor Draper, a graduate of the college, and for more than twenty years a member of its faculty, which was read at a convention of deaf-mutes held last summer at Jacksonville, Ill., discusses the subject in so thoughtful and comprehensive a manner that it seems proper to bring his suggestions to the attention of Congress and the general public. The paper will be found in the appendix to this report.

#### CHANGES IN THE CORPS OF OFFICERS AND TEACHERS.

Miss Mary T. G. Gordon resigned her position as teacher of speech last spring and completed in June last a continuous service of forty years in the institution. Miss Gordon's record has been a remarkable one.

In September, 1860, she took the position of teacher of the blind, instructing the eight blind children, then connected with the institution, in music, as well as in their literary studies.

She performed these duties successfully for five years, when our blind department was discontinued. Miss Gordon then became a teacher of the deaf and taught classes under the manual method with marked success for thirteen years, or until 1878.

She then pursued a course of training in the oral method, and for twenty-two years has been a successful teacher of speech in our Kendall School.

In 1891, when our normal department was organized, the duty of instructing the normal students in the art of teaching speech to the deaf was confided to Miss Gordon, and she has been as successful in this important work as in all her other labors.

We need hardly say that Miss Gordon's retirement, rendered necessary as it was by somewhat impaired health, is a source of regret to all connected with the institution.

Miss Ellen Gordon, who has occupied the difficult and responsible position of matron for eighteen years, resigned last spring and retired in June.

Though the years of her service in the institution have been less in number than those of her sister, she is deserving of equal honor for the faithfulness and devotion with which she has always discharged her duties, and her departure from among us is equally regretted.

All those who are familiar with the internal workings of an establishment like this are aware how constant and exhausting the demands are on the time and strength of a faithful matron; and they will understand how great praise it is of one occupying this position to say she has filled it fully and well. This can be said most truly of Miss Ellen Gordon.

Both these ladies carry with them in their retirement the warm regard and sincere respect of their many friends on Kendall Green.

Miss May Martin, a graduate of our college in 1895, who has since September of that year rendered most intelligent and acceptable service as an instructor in our college and school, resigned her position last June, and was married during the summer to a very worthy graduate of the college, of the class of 1893.

The loss of her services is a matter of sincere regret, and she has the best wishes of all connected with the institution for her future happiness.

Miss Elizabeth Peet, of New York, a daughter of the late Dr. Isaac Lewis Peet, long and favorably known as the principal of the New York Institution for Deaf-Mutes, has been appointed to fill the vacancy last referred to.

Miss Peet has had a lifelong intimacy with the deaf, and experience as a teacher in the Rhode Island school, and brings to her position here qualities which give promise of entire success.

Miss Emma Pope, a graduate of our normal department in 1894, who served with success as a teacher in our Kendall school for a year and then took a position as an instructor in the Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf, which she has filled creditably for five years, has been appointed as a teacher of speech in our Kendall school. There is every reason to expect that she will fill this position satisfactorily.

Miss Myrtle M. Ellis, of Illinois, who has had several years' experi-

ence in the domestic management of the Kansas and Illinois institutions for deaf-mutes, has been appointed matron. She comes to us with the strongest possible recommendations of exceptional fitness for her work, and it is felt that our institution is fortunate in securing the services of one who has made so creditable a record elsewhere.

#### EXERCISES OF PRESENTATION DAY.

The annual public exercises of the college took place on Wednesday, the 2d of May.

The Rev. Henry N. Couden, chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the opening prayer.

The essays of the academic class were as follows:

*Orations.*—Some Animal Friends, Ethel Z. Taylor, Colorado; The Advance of Science in the Present Century, Owen G. Carrell, Iowa; A Riddle, Emma M. Prager, Pennsylvania; The Conquests of Christianity, Littleton A. Long, Kentucky; The Spirit of Sidney Lanier's Poetry, James W. Sowell, Alabama; Athletics, Albertus Wornstaff, Ohio; Nature in Virgil, Cloa G. Lamson, Ohio.

*Dissertations.*—A Curiosity Shop, Deborah H. Marshall, Connecticut; The Childhood of the Deaf, Gertrude Parker, Delaware.

During the intermission an original poem entitled "Beatrice," by Miss May Martin, of the class of 1895, a candidate for the degree of M. A., was recited orally by Miss Grace Okie, of the junior class, and rendered in signs at the same time by Miss Annie M. Lindstrom, of the same class.

Candidates for degrees as recommended by the faculty were then presented as follows:

*For the degree of master of arts (Normal Fellows).*—Ashbel W. Dobyns, B. A., Millsaps College; Laurance E. Milligan, B. A., Illinois College; Frank R. Wheeler, M. A., Brown University; Martha C. Bell, M. S., Synodical College, Missouri; Adelaide H. Pybas, B. S., Southwestern Baptist University, Tennessee.

May Martin, B. A., Gallaudet College; Daniel Picard, B. A., Gallaudet College.

*For the degree of bachelor of arts.*—Owen George Carrell, Cloa Georgetta Lamson, Littleton Alva Long, Emma Matilda Prager, James William Sowell, Ethel Zoe Taylor, Albertus Wornstaff.

*For the degree of bachelor of letters.*—Deborah Hoyt Marshall, Gertrude Parker.

Hon. John B. Wight, secretary of the board, then announced that the directors had voted to confer the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters on the Rev. Thomas Gallaudet, D. D., vicar of St. Ann's Church for Deaf-Mutes in New York City, in recognition of his long years of successful effort for the moral elevation of the adult deaf-mutes of our country.

Dr. Gallaudet, who was present, and taken entirely by surprise by the action of the board, expressed his deep appreciation of the honor conferred.

President Gallaudet then introduced the Hon. J. L. M. Curry, D. D., secretary of the Peabody and Slater Educational Boards, who spoke as follows:

#### DOCTOR CURRY'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen: A little over forty years ago, in the Smithsonian Institution, I made my first, and up to this time last, address before an institution of learning in this city. A friend, who is on the platform, while I spoke plain prose, at that time entertained the audience with a delightful poem on mistakes. He has illustrated in prose this afternoon what he so delightfully taught in poetry some forty years ago, for I believe it is largely through his influence as a director in this institution that the mistake has been committed of inviting me to stand before you this afternoon. Although he may have made a mistake, I wish to say to these young

people here that they have not made a mistake in becoming students of this great institution.

I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart that you have been permitted to enjoy the instruction of the able faculty; to breathe the atmosphere, so fragrant and elevating, of this noble institution, and that you have had your minds and hearts so developed by the influences that have prevailed here that you will go out, when you do go out, meeting the duties and the responsibilities of life far better prepared than you could possibly have otherwise been if you had remained in your own homes, or if you had, I venture to say, gone to other institutions than this of which you are honored and favored students. I again congratulate you, and, familiar as I am with schools and colleges and commencement and presentation occasions, I say, in the sincerity of my heart, that I have never been permitted to witness exercises which have been more interesting and inspiring than this which I have enjoyed here to-day.

I saw one lady just now beginning to applaud that sentiment, and I thought you all would have shared with me in the joy of the occasion.

Of these essays to which I have listened I need not, of course, speak in detail, but I can not fail to mention what has impressed me particularly. The first essay which was repeated to us was what I might call the kinship with nature; and I was particularly delighted with the fact that, while ears may be closed with some, the eye is still open to receive knowledge and impression, and that those who are deprived of one sense can at least be placed in the enjoyment of what nature so liberally supplies for the enjoyment of human beings and for the elevation of our race.

People often laugh at me because among the books which I recommend to students and legislators and learned professors is *Black Beauty*, and I don't think that anyone should be permitted to receive a diploma until that person has been made familiar with the teachings of *Black Beauty*.

That beautiful and exquisite and scholarly interpretation of Virgil thrilled me from head to toe, and I wondered if all these students were made so familiar with both ancient and modern poetry. And I was pleased to learn that an Alabama friend—I wish he knew that I am an Alabamian as well as himself—has written so well about the poetry of a man who, in my humble judgment, before a generation shall pass will be placed among the chief poets of the English language, not only in this country, but in our mother country of Great Britain. I mean Sidney Lanier, and I am almost tempted to use the time allotted to me in speaking of him whose life was made up, it is true, of physical suffering beyond compare, and yet who enjoyed, far beyond what most people have ever enjoyed, the creations of poetry and music, and that which is better than poetry and music, the creations of love.

You are going to have a vacation before many weeks. I was reminded, while sitting here and looking over the programme, of the first vacation that I ever had when I went to school. The first schoolhouse where I matriculated was a little log cabin about 18 by 20 feet, without pictures, without blackboard, without desk, without ink wells—absolutely devoid of all the equipments with which you have been so liberally supplied—and I could not refrain from thinking that if I had had the advantages that you have I might have been of some little worth in this world in which I have been placed. But when we wanted vacation how did we get it? I don't want you to practice that upon my friend here, because we had no nine months' session then, but on a given day, agreed upon in advance, we brought long strings of mulberry bark to the schoolroom, and at a given signal the larger boys fell upon the teacher, caught him behind, and then took the mulberry bark, tied him hand and foot, bore him down to an adjacent stream, and ducked him until he had agreed to give us holiday. Please don't treat him in that way.

But my second teacher had migrated from the State of Maine down into the State of Georgia, and he had another and I suppose a New England mode of punishment. It certainly was not a Southern mode. He used to take a stick about that long [indicating], and he would take his knife and split it in the middle, without carrying it to the end, and then he would press it from both ends until it opened, and then he would put it upon our noses and make us stand like simpletons of degradation; and you will notice that my nose is sharper than yours.

I congratulate you, I repeat, on the advantages that you have here in this magnificent school. It is an honor to our great country and an honor to our great city; and I am glad that the students come from so many different States, from the West and South, and the North, and New England, and elsewhere, to enjoy the rich advantages of this institution, and I thank God that such benefits and such advantages are bestowed upon those who have been deprived of the advantage of using what old John Bunyan called ear-gate for the reception of ideas and knowledge.

I shall not be tempted into any eulogy upon education, or any description of its advantages. I recur just for the moment to my old boyish experience to illustrate



something of the advantages of education. Very often, when I was a boy—a few years ago—on muster days and election days people who were not as moral and temperate as they ought to have been indulged themselves to excess in what some people strangely call the “overjoyful,” and I have known those men under the influence of intoxicants to grow very courageous and think that they were able to conquer the whole world, and, as General Harrison said in his inaugural, the rest of mankind besides. And I have seen them pull off their coats and roll up their sleeves and swear that they could whip their weight in wildcats; that they were the best men on the earth, and nobody was comparable to them in manhood and strength. Well, suppose they could have done it. Suppose they were able to whip their weight in wildcats. Was that manhood? Not at all. Manhood as the development of the physical nature, however desirable it may be, is not true manhood, because the brutes of the forest can develop their physical powers far beyond what we can do.

True manhood is to be found in the development of the moral and the intellectual nature, and those that stand out as the types and representatives of true manhood are not your Corbetts and your Sullivans, but your Gladstones, and Lincolns, and Lees, and those men and women that illustrate all human virtues and have developed their moral and intellectual nature to the very highest degree.

I again thank you, young ladies and young gentlemen, for the exquisite enjoyment which you have furnished to at least one of your auditors this afternoon.

The exercises of the afternoon were closed with the benediction by the Rev. Thomas Gallaudet, D. D., L. H. D., vicar of St. Ann's Church for Deaf-Mutes, New York City.

Degrees were conferred at the close of the term in accordance with the recommendations of presentation day.

#### RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

The receipts and expenditures for the year under review will appear from the following detailed statements:

##### SUPPORT OF THE INSTITUTION.

###### RECEIPTS.

Balance from old account .....	\$1,099.55	Old iron .....	\$27.20
From the Treasury of the United States .....	65,000.00	Hay .....	382.59
Board, tuition, and room rent .....	3,233.75	Pigs .....	97.75
Work in shop .....	6.45	Lewis J. Davis, treasurer .....	1,000.00
Manual-labor fund .....	500.00	Total .....	71,347.29

###### EXPENDITURES.

Salaries and wages .....	\$39,963.32	Hardware .....	\$286.12
Improvements .....	1,566.18	Plants, seeds, tools, etc. ....	416.27
Miscellaneous repairs .....	1,207.61	Blacksmithing .....	138.51
Household expenses, marketing, etc .....	3,258.91	Carriage and carriage repairs ..	309.75
Meats .....	6,071.46	Ice .....	407.46
Groceries .....	3,118.08	Live stock .....	315.00
Bread .....	1,606.30	Incidental expenses .....	236.28
Butter and eggs .....	2,131.01	Crockery, etc. ....	300.33
Medical attendance and nursing .....	837.90	Stamped envelopes .....	63.60
Telephone and electric clocks ..	90.54	Auditing accounts .....	300.00
Furniture .....	871.98	Printing, etc .....	64.22
Lumber .....	407.08	Gymnasium apparatus, etc. ....	110.08
Dry goods .....	498.38	Lectures .....	130.00
Gas .....	1,294.90	Entertainment of pupils .....	90.00
Paints, oils, etc. ....	327.72	Harness and harness repairs ..	35.75
Fuel .....	2,876.58	Botanical specimens for museum ..	250.00
Feed .....	876.56	Balance .....	51.99
Medicines and chemicals .....	329.35	Total .....	71,347.29
Books, stationery, and school apparatus .....	508.07		

## SPECIAL REPAIRS.

Received from the Treasury of the United States .....	\$3,000. 00
---	-------------

## EXPENDITURES.

Painting and whitewashing .....	\$873. 94
Plumbing, sewerage, etc .....	996. 76
Asphalt pavements .....	108. 00
Paper hanging .....	347. 56
Repairing slate roofs .....	91. 49
Labor .....	582. 25

Total .....	3,000. 00
-------------	-----------

## ESTIMATES FOR NEXT YEAR.

The following estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, have already been submitted:

For the support of the institution, including salaries and incidental expenses, for books and illustrative apparatus, and for general repairs and improvements, \$69,000.

For repairs to the buildings of the institution, including plumbing and steam heating apparatus and for repairs to pavements, \$3,000.

The moderate increase in the estimate for current expenses over the amount appropriated for the present year is made necessary by the considerable addition to the number of our students which was authorized by Congress in a provision of law in the sundry civil appropriation bill approved June 6, 1900.

No estimate for additional buildings has been submitted, but an enlargement of our accommodations will be necessary in the near future to provide for the full number allowed by law.

## A GOLD MEDAL FROM THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

An exhibit of photographs and publications, from which a clear idea of the scope of the operations of the institution could be obtained, was prepared and forwarded to Paris more than a year ago through the commissioner of the United States for the exposition of 1900. The gratifying information has been received that a gold medal has been awarded to the institution on account of this exhibit.

## INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AT PARIS.

It is well known that in connection with the exposition of 1900 a series of international congresses was organized under the auspices of the French Government, to which persons interested in a great variety of subjects of public importance were invited.

One of these congresses was "for the study of questions of education and assistance of deaf-mutes."

Considering it to be fitting that this institution should be represented at a meeting of such importance, the board authorized the president and the vice-president of the college faculty to attend the congress.

An account of the congress, presented to the board by the president, will be found appended to this report.

All of which is respectfully submitted, by order of the board of directors.

E. M. GALLAUDET,  
*President.*

Hon. E. A. HITCHCOCK,  
*Secretary of the Interior.*

## APPENDIX.

---

### A.

#### REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AT PARIS.

KENDALL GREEN, *Washington, D. C., October 2, 1900.*

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to report that, as authorized by you, Professor Fay and I repaired to Paris early in August last to attend the International Congress for the Study of Questions of Education and Assistance of Deaf-Mutes, invited by the French Government to assemble in Paris on the 6th of that month.

Assistant Professor Hall, of our college faculty, met us in Paris and attended with us all the meetings of the congress.

The composition of this body was interesting and unusual. It consisted of two sections, one composed of deaf-mutes, and the other of hearing persons, mostly teachers. The former had upward of 200 members; the latter something more than 100.

The countries represented were France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Germany, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Roumania, Norway, Great Britain, the United States of America, and Mexico.

The preliminary arrangements for the congress, which required much labor and attention during many months, were in the hands of a committee at the head of which was Dr. Ladreit de Lacharrière, an eminent medical man of Paris, who had been for thirty years the attending physician of the national institution for deaf-mutes in that city. Dr. Lacharrière was made president of the congress by unanimous consent as a courteous recognition of his arduous labors for its organization. He has never been a teacher of the deaf.

I will not undertake to give with any fullness an account of the proceedings of the congress, for Professor Fay has done this in the *American Annals of the Deaf*, of which journal he is the editor.

It will be sufficient for me to give you the papers presented to the congress by Professor Fay and myself, with a brief statement of the action of the congress in regard to methods.

The following paper, prepared originally in English, was read to the congress in French, and printed copies in English, German, and Italian were distributed among the members at the time of the reading:

#### WHAT IS SPEECH WORTH TO THE DEAF?

By EDWARD M. GALLAUDET.

No more important question than this commands the attention of educators of the deaf to-day.

For the last twenty years enthusiastic and, no doubt, well-meaning men and women have been urging with ceaseless activity, both in Europe and America, the universal adoption of the oral method, the abolition of all other methods, and the rigid prohibition of the use, in and out of school, of that language which is as natural to the deaf as speech to the hearing.

The cry of these propagandists accomplished its first notable public result at Milan in 1880, when the partisan congress of that year and place shouted frantically for "la méthode orale pure."

It is the habit of these promoters of oral teaching to assert that the value of speech to the deaf is inestimable; that it is worth far more than any other attainment possible to them; that no price is too great to pay for it; that with it the deaf may be fully restored to society; that they can become like "other people;" that they can enter schools and colleges for the hearing and engage in recitations therein without special assistance.

Some have even gone so far as to claim, and this in a bill twice introduced into the Congress of the United States and favorably reported by a committee, that "it has been clearly proven that deaf children can learn articulate speech and language by the use of the eye for all practical purposes as well as children who hear can learn through the ear, provided they have this training in infancy and early childhood."

And those who make this claim seriously promise to impart to all deaf infants committed to their care such facility in speech and lip reading as will enable them to receive their education in schools for the hearing. And they declare the general adoption of measures for teaching speech to deaf children in the days of their infancy will make it possible to discontinue all existing special schools for this class of persons.

It need hardly be said that no results have as yet been attained by the advocates of this extreme policy which entitle it to serious consideration.

Before undertaking to determine the value to the deaf of the speech which is really attainable, we must consider who are the parties to the controversy over methods—whose testimony is to be received and whose opinions are to be weighed.

And we soon perceive that while the judgment of teachers always deserves serious consideration and may often be of great value, no mistake could be greater than to regard instructors as the only persons whose views are to receive our attention. Indeed, it will generally be admitted that teachers are often quite unable to judge as to the practical value of the speech of their pupils.

Many times is the speech of deaf children quite unintelligible to visitors, although their teachers understand it readily; and on such occasions these teachers express surprise that the visitors fail to understand what they easily comprehend.

The natural enthusiasm of teachers for a method, the desirability of which they are anxious to demonstrate, often warps their judgment to such an extent as to render it of little value.

May we, then, accept the opinions of the family and intimate friends of the deaf as to the value of speech to them? Not always; and for reasons similar to those which compel us sometimes to question the testimony of their teachers. Their family and intimate friends soon come to understand their speech, even though it be almost unintelligible to strangers, and so are often incompetent judges of its value in the world at large.

Of more importance than the testimony of teachers, family, and intimate friends is that of casual acquaintances and strangers, but of greatest value in the settlement of the question before us are the opinions and evidence of the deaf themselves.

From these four classes of witnesses I shall bring forward opinions and statements of fact which I hope may carry conviction to the minds of many, if not all, of my colleagues in this congress.

But before adducing this testimony, I wish to take a little time to speak of those particulars in which and circumstances under which speech is, beyond all question, of great value to the deaf.

When a deaf person can, within a reasonable period of school life, acquire a power of speech and lip reading that will enable him or her to converse readily with strangers in social life, in business, and in travel, the acquisition is undoubtedly worth all it has cost.

Many of the advocates of the pure oral method do not hesitate to assure a confiding public that all deaf-mutes are capable of such success in speech. Were this true the controversy over methods would have long since come to an end; but unfortunately it is far from the truth, and so we find in all countries those who question more or less seriously the wisdom of banishing from schools for the deaf all methods except the oral.

In 1867 it was my privilege to make a careful examination of more than forty schools for the deaf in Europe. I was then a young man seeking instruction from my elders. The chief object of my investigation was to determine, if possible, the question I am discussing to-day. It was my good fortune to meet in 1867 nearly all the men prominent at that time in our profession, and, as was natural, I asked them many questions. It will be sufficient for the purpose of this paper to quote from one of these eminent men, "facile princeps" among the teachers of the deaf of his time, Moritz Hill, of Weissenfels. The day I spent with Hill in his school is a precious memory, and doubly so as I had for an interpreter my lifelong friend, Dr. Felix Flugel, the eminent lexicographer, still living in Leipzig.

Anxious to know Mr. Hill's opinion as to the practical value of speech to the mass of his pupils, I asked some questions, which he answered as follows:

"Out of 100 pupils, 85 are capable, when leaving the school, of conversing on commonplace subjects with their teachers, family, and intimate friends; 62 can do so easily."

"Out of 100, 11 can converse readily with strangers on ordinary subjects. Many others learn to do this after quitting school."

In the careful analysis I propose to make of this testimony of Hill's, I concede everything he claims, and shall not, therefore, have to take any account of the teacher's enthusiasm or natural bias for his own method.

First, I notice that 15 out of every hundred are not capable of conversing even on commonplace subjects with their teachers, families, and intimate friends. In speech they are failures. And yet do doubt they have spent many weary hours striving after the unattainable, and many other weary hours oblivious of the instruction their teachers were giving orally to their more favored schoolmates.

In the United States there are 10,000 deaf children in school. According to Hill, 1,500 of these are incapable of success in speech. To them speech is of no value, and the time spent in trying to acquire it is worse than wasted, and should be given to something of worth which is within reach of their faculties. The same proportion will, of course, apply to the deaf in Europe.

Let us now consider those who can "converse on commonplace subjects with their teachers, family, and intimate friends," and what speech is worth to them.

Hill says that out of 100, 85 can do this, this number including the 11 who can do more. Making the necessary reduction, we have 74 whose intelligent use of speech, and this "on commonplace subjects" it must be observed, is limited to the narrow circle of "teachers, family, and intimate friends."

I ask you, my colleagues, to consider what this means. What real conversation, of a stimulating or elevating sort, can these deaf persons hope for in the home circle or among their most intimate friends if they are to be held down forever to the deadly level of the commonplace?

And yet this 74 per cent comprises those who stand for the average successes of the oral method.

How much better off are they than others of equal intelligence who have spent no time in learning to speak, but whose "family and intimate friends" have gladly, for their sake, learned the manual alphabet, and possibly some signs, and by these means are able to have actual conversations with their deaf friends on any subject, often rising far above the level of the commonplace?

Speaking from a personal acquaintance with some thousands of deaf persons, I am fully convinced that comparing the lot of the 74 per cent we are now considering, cut off as they naturally would be from the use of signs and the finger alphabet, with an equal number educated without speech, but well taught on the manual method, the lot of the latter would be far happier and more successful than that of the former.

Let us see now what conclusions must be drawn, if my judgment be just, as to the value of speech to the 10,000 deaf children now in school in my own country.

Fifteen per cent must be set down as getting nothing from speech. Adding to these the 74 per cent we have just been discussing, we have 8,900 whose lives would be happier and more successful were they well educated on the manual method, than if they were educated on the pure oral method. And the same ratio would apply to the deaf of Europe. What then is speech worth to this large majority of the deaf?

In this connection I call to mind a visit I made some years since to the home of a deaf young man, then a student in our college at Washington, all of whose early education had been conducted on the pure oral method. His father was a man of wealth, and he had had as his private tutor one of the most eminent oral teachers of our country. The young man to whom I refer depended on speech and lip reading for his intercourse with his family, and I observed with much surprise that he took little part in the conversation at table or around the fireside. His friends made no attempt to help him understand the lively talk that was going on about him, and he sat much of the time silent and isolated. His neglected and forlorn condition excited my sympathy, and I could not help comparing it with that of many deaf-mutes of my acquaintance, whose friends communicate freely with them by means of the manual alphabet, giving them rapidly and freely all the "give and take" of the home circle.

These, I am confident, had far greater social enjoyment in their families and among their friends than the orally taught youth to whom I have alluded. As I saw him, his speech was of little worth even among his family and immediate friends.

In support of the opinion that this is true of many orally taught deaf persons, I will now bring forward the testimony of a witness whose appearance in this discussion will surprise many, but whose commanding intellectual ability and whose keen powers of observation no one will question. I refer to the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the well-known British cabinet minister and member of Parliament.

Mr. Chamberlain spent the greater part of a day at the institution at Washington

in 1888, when I had the pleasure of exhibiting to him our methods of instruction in much detail, from the most elementary work of our primary school on through the highest classes of the college.

Three months later Mr. Chamberlain was called before the royal commission on the deaf and the blind in England and asked to give an account of his visit to the college and to state his views in general in regard to the education of the deaf. His testimony fills four and a quarter closely printed folio pages of the report of the commission, and shows him to have been an observer of remarkable powers. He speaks of methods and their relation to each other with the clearness and precision of an expert.

In answer to the following question, "Was the impression you formed from visiting that institution that the combined system was a good one for the deaf and dumb, and that it could be carried on with success?" Mr. Chamberlain replied: "At the time my attention was not specially directed to the question, which I think has been occupying you very much, but I have thought of it a good deal since. I am quite satisfied with the results I saw, and, thinking it over since, I confess I can not bring myself to believe that the oral method could possibly be satisfactory by itself. I am strongly in favor of the combined system."

To the following question: "Was your impression from what you saw at the Washington college that if the pupils had been taught by the pure oral method, they, in their intercourse with each other and with many of the outside world also, would still have recourse to signs?" Mr. Chamberlain replied: "I think it would be absolutely necessary for them to do so if they are to have any real enjoyment of life."

At the very end of his testimony two answers of Mr. Chamberlain's appear, which will be seen to be especially pertinent to this discussion, and which will, I think, commend themselves to very many teachers, and especially to the deaf themselves.

Question. "Suppose there are two deaf mutes, one who could speak orally only, and the other who carried on conversation by signs and the manual alphabet, which do you think would get on best in the world?"

Answer. "I would rather be the one who could speak by signs."

Question. That is supposing you lived in a community of sign-speaking people?"

Answer. "No; what I should say is that one who spoke by signs would have a perfect communication with his intimate friends and relations, and that that was worth more than an imperfect communication with the outer world."

Turning from the views of the eminent statesman I have just quoted, let us consider the opinions of the educated deaf themselves as expressed in conventions, in their publications, and in other ways.

I am aware that certain teachers of prominence have declared that the views of the deaf in this discussion are of no value. This ground was taken in Germany a few years since; when a petition numerously signed by educated deaf-mutes of that country was presented to the Emperor praying that essential modifications might be made in the methods employed in the German schools. It seems to me hardly necessary to controvert so groundless a claim as this, that the intelligent educated deaf-mute is not capable of judging as to the value of the training he has received in school, for those who make it confess one of two things—either the training they have given their pupils is insufficient and crude or they themselves fail to understand the mind and disposition of those they have taught. As to the opinion of the deaf themselves (as expressed in their conventions), it will hardly be necessary for me to do more than allude to the fact, no doubt known to you all, that in these gatherings of the deaf, held as they have been in many of the prominent cities of Europe and America, a variety of methods in the education of their class is uniformly and almost unanimously demanded.

I have taken pains during the past few years to come into personal intercourse with many hundreds of the adult deaf in Great Britain and Ireland, in France, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, and Germany. I have found among them many of great intelligence and keen powers of discrimination, and their testimony has been most decided that to the average deaf-mute, those included in the 74 per cent we have been considering, the practical value of speech was small.

In an address given in London three years ago, I brought forward much individual testimony from educated deaf-mutes on this point, which I will not now repeat. I will only quote from a letter recently received from a deaf-mute of deserved prominence in Germany, one who has been designated by the German minister of education as a council member of this congress.

This gentleman, having been educated in an oral school, and able to speak and read from the lips with more than average facility, writes to me as follows in answer to certain questions:

"I think speech can never be of real worth to the deaf, because a great many of

them can not pronounce perfectly well. The German teachers have long known this, and have made many proposals for another system of education, but without any effect until now. Some teachers have written to me that they could not but give the palm to the excellent results of those schools which have adopted the combined system, over those German schools that make use of the oral method alone. The most of the German teachers are convinced that the pure oral method is an insufficient method of teaching. It is true that deaf-mutes, educated by the pure oral method, generally give up trying to speak with strangers after leaving school, and they look for friends among the deaf. Thus we see the impossibility of preventing the exclusiveness of deaf-mutes by teaching them orally. Most of the teachers of the deaf in Germany are not deaf, and have, therefore, little knowledge of the inner feeling and thinking of the deaf. This I regard as a calamity in our schools."

That the best educated deaf persons in Germany entertain, generally, the views I have just quoted from a representative of this class, I know through personal acquaintance with many.

At the International Congress of Instructors of the Deaf, held in 1893 at Chicago, an instructive paper was read by a highly educated deaf man on "The orally taught deaf after leaving school." In preparing his paper the writer had interrogated many orally taught deaf persons as to their experience in adult life. He gives in full a letter, the statements of one which may be taken as typical of the condition and disappointments of many. I give only portions of this letter.

"Had your questions been presented to me twenty years ago, when I first left school, I should probably have drawn a more rose-colored picture. Now I can only say that while I consider oral teaching valuable, and worthy of pursuit by all the deaf, it does not and can not work miracles. No deaf person can be fully restored to society, except by the removal of deafness. It is an insurpassable obstacle to general conversation—a heavy incumbrance everywhere.

"With respect to the orally taught I have felt deeply of late that their position was an extremely anomalous one. They stand between two classes, having affinities with both, but really belonging to neither. As one lady—herself a fine oralist—said, 'We do not fit in anywhere. We go among the hearing, converse with them to some extent, and are kindly received. We go among the deaf and dumb, talk with them as far as we can, and are welcomed with courtesy. But the fact is that each class has a language of its own, and in neither case is that language perfectly intelligible to us. We are simply mongrels.'

"Now these are strong statements, and would terribly shock my good teachers. But they are the result of hard and bitter experience, and I can not soften them without doing violence to my conscience. \* \* \* A number of others feel just as I do."

I could bring forward much additional testimony from intelligent orally taught deaf persons to prove that to very many the practical benefits of the speech laboriously acquired in school are far less than the assurances of their teachers led them to anticipate. I will not, however, take time for this, but will pass on to consider Hill's declaration that "out of 100 (orally taught deaf-mutes) 11 can converse readily with strangers on ordinary subjects. Many others learn to do this after quitting school."

Here again I will give the largest reasonable consideration to Hill's claim, and admit that those who improve in their speech after leaving school so as to be able to converse readily with strangers will be as many as those who learn to do this while in school. This will give us an aggregate of 22 per cent of all the deaf who may expect to attain a full measure of success in learning to speak and in reading the lips of others. And in estimating the value of speech to these I will attach no great weight to the fact that Hill claims no more than that these can converse readily with strangers on ordinary subjects. Nor will I do more than suggest that in this 22 per cent will be found those we term semi-mute and semi-deaf, whose speech has therefore been acquired by means not greatly different from those by which normal children learn to speak.

For the sake of the argument I will fully concede that 22 per cent of the deaf may attain a perfection in speech fully compensating for the time and money expended, and that to these speech is worth all it has cost.

This conclusion will be accorded full consideration in the closing summation of the present discussion.

I will now ask attention to a very delicate matter in connection with the oral education of the deaf, which I approach with a good deal of hesitation. And I wish to say in advance that to the question I am about to raise I do not propose to give any answer or to express an opinion. I shall simply speak of some things to which my attention has been directed and leave others to determine whether they settle the question or not.

This is my query: Is there anything in the process of the oral education of the deaf which has a tendency to impair the moral sense of those who engage in it, either as teachers or pupils?

Many of my colleagues no doubt remember the serious criticism made by the deservedly distinguished Edward Walther, of Berlin, on certain teachers in his valuable work, *Handbuch der Taubstummenbildung*, published in 1895, in which he says of some who make extravagant claims as to the achievements of the oral method: "Since it is hardly possible that they deceive themselves, their object must be to deceive others."

This serious indictment made a profound impression on my mind, and has led me to take note of many incidents which have come under my notice within the past five years, one or two of which I will now relate.

At a certain convention of instructors in my own country there were present a number of orally taught pupils who had been brought there to be exhibited. One of them was found one day making signs, and on being asked if signs were allowed in the school from which she came replied: "O, yes! but Mr. ——— told us we must not make any signs here and I forgot." The same girl was found a little later to have enough hearing to understand spoken words without seeing the mouth of the speaker, and when asked if she had always heard as much replied: "Yes; but Mr. ——— told me I must not let it be known here that I heard."

Are not these injunctions to conceal facts of a piece with what often occurs when the speech of deaf children is being exhibited and visitors are led to conclude that those before them were born deaf, when in fact many of them, and these generally the most fluent speakers, either possessed some hearing, or had acquired speech before becoming deaf? Is it not common for oral teachers to assure their pupils that if they exert themselves to succeed with speech, they may avoid being recognized as deaf persons, may appear "just like other people;" in short, that they may deceive others?"

The limits of this paper will not permit the mention of many similar incidents which have come under my notice, and I will dismiss the question I have raised with the remark, that if in their sincere enthusiasm to impart the great boon of speech to as many deaf children as possible, some oral teachers plant seeds of untruthfulness in the minds of their pupils, a very high, even a ruinous price, is being paid for an accomplishment which is found in many cases to be of comparatively little practical value.

I will now, Mr. President and honored colleagues, present the conclusions I have endeavored to reach.

During the thirty years which have passed since my memorable interview with Hill, of Weissenfels, I have met with great numbers of orally taught deaf-mutes and have visited many oral schools. Nothing has led me to doubt the correctness of Hill's quoted statements. What he said in 1867 is, in my opinion, true to-day. Making the best I can for the cause of oralism from his percentages, I conclude that for 22 per cent of the deaf speech is worth what it costs; that for 15 per cent it is of no use, and that for the remainder its value is by no means as great as the public has been led by the ardent supporters of the pure oral method to believe. More than this, when I consider the testimony of the deaf themselves and that of the many parents who have confessed to me their great disappointment at the results of the oral teaching of their children, I feel satisfied in concluding that for at least 50 per cent of the deaf, so far as attempts to teach speech are concerned, "the game is not worth the candle."

Under these conditions what should be the policy of true friends of the deaf as to methods? Can the course of those who insist on a single method be approved? Assuredly not.

Nothing is more clear to the intelligent and unprejudiced observer of deaf children than that their mental and physical capabilities are far from being the same. It is impossible to force all to the standards and requirements of a single method.

The method must be adapted to the child. And so it follows, logically and naturally, that for the best development of all the deaf, a combined system must be employed. I do not say "the" combined system, for many combinations are possible, suggested by differing conditions, some of which may be preferable to others, but all of which are more effective of results than any single method.

It is well known that in my country the great majority of the deaf are being educated on a combined system. It is, perhaps, not so well known that in the combined-system schools more than half the pupils are taught to speak, and that in most of them all are given the opportunity to acquire speech.

I hope I shall not be regarded as boastful when I express the belief that the American schools for the deaf are to-day, as a whole, organized and conducted on a system calculated to secure "the greatest good of the greatest number," and that



any defects that may be found are incidental, due to local causes, and easily removable.

In conclusion, I will venture to express the belief that the time is not distant when European teachers, generally, will conclude what many have already discovered, that the value of speech to many of the deaf has in the past been greatly overestimated, and that a broad system of education, using all means that have been found of service, is far more fruitful of results than any single method can possibly be.

The following paper was read in French to the congress by its author:

#### THE SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE DEAF IN AMERICA.

By EDWARD ALLEN FAY.

As the attempt is made in America to carry the education of the deaf to a higher point than in any other part of the world, this memoir will consist chiefly of a brief history of the secondary and higher education of the deaf in this country, especially of Gallaudet College.

The first permanent school for the education of the deaf in America was established at Hartford, Conn., in 1817, by the Rev. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, LL. D. At first the advanced age at which many of the pupils entered school, and the limited time they were permitted to remain, rendered anything more than an elementary course of instruction out of the question; but Dr. Gallaudet and his associates were men of liberal education and broad culture, and the possibility of imparting to the deaf the benefit of a higher education, such as they themselves had received in American colleges, was early a matter of discussion among them. Dr. Gallaudet himself expressed his belief in its possibility, and predicted that the time would come when a college for the higher education of the deaf would be established.

The first public advocacy of advanced instruction for the deaf seems to have been made by Mr. Jared A. Ayres, a teacher in the Hartford school, in an article entitled "A complete education for the deaf and dumb," published in the *American Annals of the Deaf*, in 1848, the second year of the existence of this periodical. Mr. Ayres maintained that, when once a mastery of the national language had been attained, the study of foreign languages, higher mathematics, natural sciences, philosophy, and history, though perhaps more difficult, was no less possible for the deaf than for hearing persons.

Two years later, at the First Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in 1850, Mr. Jacob Van Nostrand, a teacher in the New York Institution, read a paper entitled "Necessity of a higher standard of education for the deaf and dumb." He urged American teachers not to rest content with the achievements of the past, but to open to the mind of the deaf-mute a wider range in the fields of knowledge than he had heretofore enjoyed.

As a practical step in this direction he suggested that from among the graduates of an institution, those pupils whose proficiency in language and general character for diligence and application to their studies made them suitable candidates for the distinction should be selected, and should be offered the privilege of a still further course of one or two years' instruction. The class thus formed should be called the class of merit or of honor, and the course of study should include mental and moral philosophy, natural history, mathematics and natural philosophy, astronomy, history, and the English language. The convention, after discussion of Mr. Van Nostrand's paper, adopted a resolution urging that the time allotted to the course of instruction in schools for the deaf should be very materially extended.

In the following year (1851) the subject again came before the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf. The Rev. William W. Turner, then an instructor and afterwards principal of the Hartford school, read a paper entitled "High school for the deaf and dumb." Instead of the high classes in existing institutions proposed by Mr. Van Nostrand, Mr. Turner advocated a separate high school for the whole country, to receive only those who had completed a regular course of study at the State institutions, together with those semi-mutes who had in other ways acquired an equal amount of knowledge. It should afford its students a three-years' course of instruction under two of the ablest professors that could be obtained. Funds for the purchase of grounds, the erection of buildings, and the endowment of two professorships might be raised by individual subscriptions, and the legislatures of the several States might then be asked to make an appropriation for the support of capable pupils.

In the discussion that followed, while there was some question as to the possibility of obtaining the necessary funds for establishing a separate school, and some fear that such a school, if successful, might interfere with the prosperity of existing institutions, the expression of opinion was unanimous that in some way, either by found-

ing a high school or by founding high classes in existing schools, provision ought to be made for the higher education of the deaf. One member of the convention, the Rev. James A. Cary, superintendent of the Ohio institution, made the happy suggestion that application might be made to the Congress of the United States to aid in the establishment of a high school for the deaf of the nation. Finally, the matter was referred to a select committee with instructions to report at the next convention, to be held a year later, as to the expediency and feasibility of the high-school plan and the best way of carrying it into effect.

The next convention for some reason was not held until two years later. Meanwhile the authorities of the two oldest schools in the United States, those at Hartford and New York, did not wait for the report of the committee. In 1852 these schools, both at about the same time, established classes for the higher instruction of selected pupils somewhat on the model of the "classe de perfectionnement," founded a few years previously by Dr. Itard in the Paris Institution. The advanced class at Hartford, called the "Gallaudet high class," in memory of the founder of deaf-mute instruction in America, who had recently died, was placed in charge, first, of Mr. Turner, and, when he became principal, of Mr. Ayres. The high class at New York was taught from the beginning and for fifteen years continuously by Dr. Isaac Lewis Peet, afterwards principal of the institution. The additional term of study at each school was fixed for the time being at two years. At each school the course of study included mathematics, natural philosophy, natural history, history, grammar, logic, and drawing.

In view of this action, the committee reported to the convention when it met in 1853 that, while they favored the establishment of a separate high school at some future time, they recommended that no measures should be taken at present which should interrupt or interfere with the working of the experiment begun in Hartford and New York. They advised rather to wait for the full development of this experiment, which they said might be necessary as a preliminary step to the establishment of a separate high school. The report of the committee was adopted by the convention.

The high classes established in the Hartford and New York institutions were successful from the beginning, giving excellent instruction to the brightest pupils in those schools who had completed the regular course, and also to some pupils from other schools. It was, however, only secondary instruction, and did not attempt or aim to reach the higher standard of the American college, nor had anything more than secondary instruction been proposed for the future separate high school advocated by Mr. Turner.

The first definite public suggestion of a college education for the deaf came from a congenital deaf-mute, Mr. John Carlin, a graduate of the Pennsylvania institution, who, by subsequent reading and study, had raised himself to a high point of education and culture. In an article published in the American Annals for the Deaf, in 1854, entitled "The national college for mutes," Mr. Carlin proposed the establishment of a college for the deaf which should offer a course of instruction corresponding to that of American colleges for hearing persons, and should confer the usual collegiate degrees on the completion of the course. He suggested that, if the directors of the New York institution approved, the college might be built on the ample estate of that institution at Washington Heights, a beautiful suburb of New York, and that the legislatures of the several States, as well as benevolent individuals, should be asked to supply the necessary funds for its support. There was no public opposition to Mr. Carlin's scheme except the expression of opinion from one quarter that the number of the deaf likely to seek a college education was not yet sufficiently large to justify it; but the directors of the New York institution did not respond to his suggestion as to the use of their grounds.

Three years later, in 1857, the Columbia Institution for the instruction of the deaf children of the District of Columbia was incorporated by the Congress of the United States, and Edward M. Gallaudet was invited to become its superintendent. Dr. Gallaudet was then twenty years of age. He was the youngest son of the founder of deaf-mute instruction in America, a graduate of Trinity College, Hartford, and had been for eighteen months a teacher in the Hartford School for the Deaf. The son of a noble and highly cultivated deaf-mute mother, sharing the high appreciation of the intellectual capacity of the deaf which he had often heard expressed by his father, and which had been confirmed by his acquaintance with some bright young fellows in the Hartford high class, the establishment of a college for the deaf was the ideal purpose of his life. Up to that time the only way for the accomplishment of this purpose that had seemed feasible to him was to induce some philanthropic millionaire to endow the proposed college with the necessary means of support; and the philanthropic millionaire had not yet presented himself.

When the call to Washington came, though it was only a small local primary school that was offered him, he instantly saw in it the possibility of the future realization of his ideal. For the time being he knew that the immediate task before him would be the building up of the primary school; but he foresaw that when that task had been successfully accomplished and the confidence of Congress had been fully gained, a golden opportunity would be afforded for seeking national aid for a national college for the higher education of the deaf.

In 1862, five years after the establishment of the Columbia Institution, Dr. Gallaudet felt that the right time to ask for a college had come. In his annual report for that year he called the attention of the Congress of the United States to the importance of providing higher education for the deaf, and to the fact that the peculiar organization of the Columbia Institution afforded an opportunity for the foundation within it of a college for the whole country. This peculiarity of organization consisted in the provision of its act of incorporation that pupils might be received into the institution "from any of the States and Territories of the United States on such terms as might be agreed upon by themselves, their parents, guardians, or trustees, and the proper authorities of the said institution;" and further, that no limit was fixed to the term of instruction, except that the pupils should be of "teachable age."

In April, 1864, Congress responded favorably to Dr. Gallaudet's suggestion. An act authorizing the board of directors of the institution "to grant and confer such degrees in the liberal arts and sciences as are usually granted and conferred in colleges" was, after considerable discussion, passed without a dissenting voice in either branch of Congress. Congress showed its further approval of the new departure within the next few years by making a considerable increase in its annual grants for support, by appropriating large sums for the purchase of additional grounds and the erection of new buildings, and by providing that a limited number of students might be admitted to the collegiate department from the several States and Territories free of charge. The number of students thus admitted free was at first 10; the number has been increased by acts of Congress from time to time until it is now 100. Congress has dealt very liberally with the institution ever since the establishment of the department for higher education. It has bestowed upon it an estate of 100 acres with large and beautiful buildings, the whole valued at \$700,000, and it now makes an annual appropriation for its support of about \$60,000.

On the 28th of June, 1864, the new department of the institution was publicly inaugurated under the name of the National Deaf-Mute College. Dr. Gallaudet, who had hitherto been superintendent of the institution, was now inaugurated as president of the corporation and of the board of directors. On this occasion the board exercised for the first time its recently acquired power to grant degrees by conferring the honorary degree of master of arts upon John Carlin, the deaf-mute who ten years before had been the first person publicly to advocate the establishment of a college for the higher education of the deaf. Mr. Carlin was present and delivered an oration. Among others who gave addresses on this occasion was the venerable deaf-mute, Laurent Clerc, who came from France in 1817 to assist the elder Dr. Gallaudet in organizing the school at Hartford.

In September of the same year (1864) the college work began with 7 students and 1 professor, besides Dr. Gallaudet, who, in addition to his work as president, has always taught certain branches. Since that time the numbers have increased from year to year; during the past year there have been 107 students with 14 professors and instructors, besides 7 assistants in the department of articulation. The number of students would be much larger, were it not kept down by the strict requirements for admission; for instance, this summer 70 pupils in various schools in the United States have presented themselves as candidates for admission in the autumn and only 33 of these have been admitted. The total number of students who have attended the college for a longer or shorter period is 568. The number who have completed full courses of instruction and received the degree of bachelor of arts, letters, science, or philosophy is 180. Of these 150 have taken the degree of bachelor of arts.

The course of study leading to the bachelor's degree, as in most American colleges, covers a period of four years; but in consequence of the inability of most of the schools for the deaf in the United States to prepare their pupils fully for admission to this course, it was found necessary in the early history of the college to establish an additional introductory course of two years. Later the schools raised their standard of preparation somewhat, so that since 1881 it has been possible to limit the introductory course to one year. Now a few of the schools are beginning to send pupils prepared for the first year of regular college work, and it is hoped that at some future time all the schools will do so; then the introductory class can be dispensed with

and the entire time of the professors and instructors be given to the four years of regular college work. At present the curriculum, including the introductory course, occupies a period of five years.

Candidates for admission to the introductory class are required to pass rigid written examinations in English composition and grammar, arithmetic, the history of the United States and of England, political geography, physical geography, and the elements of natural philosophy. Candidates for admission to the lowest regular college class are required to pass, in addition, examinations in English history, algebra, and Latin.

The course of study prescribed for the degree of bachelor of arts, which is that pursued by a large majority of the students, includes the English language and literature, with practice in composition through the entire period; Latin for two and a third years; French and German for a year each; mathematics, including algebra, geometry, trigonometry, and mechanics; natural science, including chemistry, with laboratory work, natural philosophy, astronomy, botany, zoology, geology, and mineralogy; history, ancient, mediæval, and modern; philosophy and political science, including logic, mental science, moral philosophy, evidences of Christianity, political economy, international law, and aesthetics. Instruction is also given in articulation and speech reading, drawing, bookkeeping, and gymnastics.

[Professor Fay included in his paper as presented to the congress the detailed schedule of studies published in the College Catalogue, which does not need to be repeated here.]

This course of study has been pursued with slight variations ever since the college was established. The faculty hope at some future time to be able to relegate some studies which are now a part of the college course to the preparatory schools, but thus far it has seemed wise to endeavor to raise the standard of scholarship by demanding an ever more and more thorough mastery of the studies prescribed rather than by prescribing more advanced studies.

Four events in the recent history of the college are worthy of mention.

In 1887, in response to an earnest appeal from women for an equal share with men in the advantages of higher education, the doors of the college were opened to deaf young women. This experiment was made with fear and trembling, but its results, on the whole, have been satisfactory. At present, of the 103 students, 39, or 36½ per cent, are young women.

In 1891 a normal department for the training of hearing teachers of the deaf was established with the double purpose of raising the standard of teachers in American schools for the deaf and of affording the deaf students of the college increased opportunities for practice in speech and speech reading. From four to six graduates of hearing colleges are admitted to this department each year, and after a year's training in both the manual and oral methods of instruction they generally find places as teachers in schools for the deaf.

In 1894, in accordance with a petition from the graduates of the college, its name was changed from the National Deaf-Mute College to Gallaudet College, in honor of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, the founder of deaf-mute instruction in America, a beautiful bronze statue of whom had been placed in the college grounds by the deaf people of the United States in 1889. It is certainly appropriate that the college which, though not established by the elder Dr. Gallaudet, is yet the crowning result of his philanthropic labors, should bear his honored name. In some respects it would have been still more appropriate if the new title had been given in honor of the man to whose faith and courage the college directly owed its existence, and under whose wise and able direction it has been carried on from the beginning; but since he himself rendered this impossible by refusing his consent, there is satisfaction in the thought that, after all, the title of the college is the same that it would have been if given in recognition of its founder, and that, whether he would or not, his name can never be dissociated from his work.

Since 1896 the college has offered, in addition to its regular course leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, a provisional course of technical instruction, including architecture, practical chemistry, electrical and mechanical engineering, surveying, ornamental gardening and floriculture, and the application of arts to manufacture. Some of these branches are now being pursued by several students, but the full development of the course still lies in the future.

The relations of the college with the schools for the deaf in the United States are friendly and sympathetic, and the effect of its establishment has been to unify and elevate the courses of instruction in the schools. Examinations for admission to the college are held at the schools when desired, and the hope of being admitted to its privileges on the completion of their school course is a strong incentive and inspiration to the brightest of the pupils. Even those who are not able to share directly in its advantages take interest and pride in its work, and the deaf as a class in America

feel that they are raised to a distinctly higher plane by the existence of a college for their benefit.

The graduates of the college have generally been able to secure positions of a higher grade than would have been open to them without a college education. From statistics compiled by one of themselves and published in the proceedings of their alumni association this year we learn that of those who have completed the full course of study 2 are professors and 3 instructors in their alma mater, 5 are principals or superintendents of schools, 72 are teachers and 8 supervisors in schools, 5 are ordained ministers of the gospel, 1 is a lawyer, 1 a demonstrator of microscopy in a university for hearing men, 1 the State botanist of North Carolina, 1 a banker, 1 a United States weather observer, 3 are architects, 3 artists, 2 chemists, 2 editors of newspapers for the hearing public, and eleven Government clerks. Others are farmers, fruit raisers, insurance and shipping clerks, publishers, printers, photographers, etc. Of those who have attended the college without completing the full course no definite statistics have been collected, but we know that many of them are engaged in similar desirable occupations.

One of the questions proposed for discussion at this congress was whether special schools should be created for particularly gifted deaf-mutes, or simply annex courses in existing schools.<sup>1</sup> Our experience in America is decidedly in favor of special schools. The discipline suited for the more advanced students is entirely different from that required for the younger pupils, and no ordinary school for the deaf can furnish a sufficiently large number of advanced students to form properly graded classes or to justify the great additional expense necessary for the equipment and professors for higher instruction.

Another question sometimes raised is whether deaf-mutes can not be as well or better educated in colleges for hearing persons as in a special college for the deaf. Undoubtedly it is possible for them, under favorable circumstances, to be so educated. Several deaf-mutes have pursued courses in hearing colleges in America and have been rewarded with collegiate degrees. But their difficulty in communicating with the professors and their fellow-students, the interruption to the regular work of the class room caused by their deafness, their dependence upon others for reports of lectures and recitations, their sad isolation among their fellows, all make their college life so different from that of college students in general that a large part of its usual benefits is lost to them. As one of their own number has said, a deaf man in a hearing college is like a one-legged man in a game of football; "the twenty-one other players and the officers of the game *can* accommodate their efforts to the crippled one, but at how great a sacrifice of their satisfaction, freedom, and power, and at what a tax on the sensibilities of spectators."

In such a college as Gallaudet, on the contrary, there is perfect freedom of communication between students and professors and among the students themselves; the course of instruction, while aiming in general at the same kind of training and culture as that afforded by hearing colleges for higher education, is adapted to the special needs of the deaf, and the students, meeting one another on terms of equality in the lecture and recitation room, in the debating and literary society, in athletic sports, and in all the give-and-take of college intercourse, receive a preparation for the struggles and duties of life that is impossible to a deaf person in a college for hearing persons.

In America Gallaudet College is regarded by the deaf themselves, by their friends, and by cultivated people generally who know of its work as a priceless boon, the crowning glory of the instruction of the deaf in that country. May the day soon come when to the deaf of every land similar opportunities of education and progress shall be offered!

---

The action of the congress in regard to methods involved proceedings which are certainly open to question, and, as was felt by many present, justly subject to criticism.

The numerical majority of the hearing section was in the hands of the French, Italian, and Belgian teachers, who were united in favor of a declaration supporting the pure oral method. And since no limit was placed on the number of delegates admitted from a school or the geographical divisions near to Paris, the votes of delegates from distant countries, necessarily few in number, were deprived of the representative value to which they were justly entitled.

The members of the deaf section, among whom were many of the mostly highly educated and intelligent deaf-mutes in the world, proposed to the members of the hearing section that a joint meeting should be held for the consideration of and final

---

<sup>1</sup>"Y a-t-il lieu de créer, pour les sourds-muets particulièrement bien doués, des écoles spéciales, ou simplement des cours annexes dans les écoles actuelles?"

vote on resolutions. This proposal was rejected by the hearing section, for a reason that will presently be apparent. At the conclusion of the discussion upon methods in the hearing section Professor Fay offered the following:

"The congress, considering that deaf children are not all upon the same plane of intellectual and physical aptitudes for the acquisition of speech and speech reading, is of the opinion that the instruction of these children should not be limited to the rigorous application of a single method, but that the method should be chosen according to the aptitude of the pupil, and that all means should be employed which can contribute to the best intellectual and moral development of each individual.

"The congress, considering the value of speech and speech reading, is of the opinion that all deaf children should be taught speech on entering school, and that this instruction should be continued with all those who succeed in it."

These resolutions received the votes of the members from the United States,<sup>1</sup> Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and Denmark, but they were voted down by the large majority of persons present from France, Belgium, and Italy, and the following resolutions were adopted in their stead:

"The congress, considering the incontestable superiority of speech over signs in restoring the deaf-mute to society and giving him a more perfect knowledge of language, declares to adhesion to the decisions of the Milan congress.

"It expresses the opinion (1) that institutions and teachers of the deaf should exert their efforts toward the establishment of the school books and teaching material necessary to the instruction of the deaf; (2) that the books and material formed in any school should be obtainable at cost price by other schools."

I moved that, in order to bring the resolutions adopted into accord with the actual fact, the words "Hearing section of the congress" be substituted for the word "Congress" in all places where the latter occurred. This motion was defeated.

The deaf section adopted with unanimity the resolutions prepared by Professor Fay, with the addition of a clause to the effect that where oral instruction does not prove successful pupils should be taught by signs.

The president and secretary of the deaf section placed in my hands a copy of the resolutions adopted by their section, requesting me to present it to the hearing section for the information of its members. On asking the floor from President Lacharrière, that I might perform this simple act of courtesy to the members of the coordinate section, I was refused.

I think it will not be difficult to discern what is to be taken as the real declaration of the International Congress of Paris of 1900 as to methods of instruction.

I have before me as I write a copy, in Dr. Lacharrière's own hand, of a letter to the minister of the interior on the 6th of August, in which he speaks of "the congress which has opened to-day with a membership of more than 400."

If we take the congress, as would seem to be only just, to be what its president reported to his official superior and ask for what method of instruction the majority of its votes was cast we find it was certainly not for the pure oral method, but for the broad system described in Professor Fay's resolutions.

And this action receives an added significance in that it has the unqualified indorsement of the educated deaf themselves, whose opinions as to the merits of the methods under which they have been trained, formed, as they must have been, after years of struggle in the battle of life, are entitled to general respect, and even to that of teachers who disagree with them.

It is evident that had the two sections of the congress met in joint session to consider resolutions as to methods, Professor Fay's, in favor of a combined system, such as prevails generally in America to-day, would have been adopted by a decisive majority. And it is equally plain that the approval given to the Milan declaration of twenty years ago for the pure oral method was the voice of no more than that of the smaller "section" of the congress, its vote to call itself "the congress," to the contrary notwithstanding.

In spite of these regrettable incidents there is reason to hope that good for the cause of the education of the deaf will result from the Paris congress of 1900.

The votes of such meetings are not binding, even on those who cast them. Under the influence of full and free discussion opinions change. And I am confident that the views presented at Paris by delegates from Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, and this country, sustained as they were by the entire body of deaf delegates, will find general acceptance in the near future.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

E. M. GALLAUDET, *President.*

THE DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Bell was not present when the vote was taken.

## B.

## GALLAUDET COLLEGE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.

By AMOS G. DRAPER.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Illinois Association: The subject indicated by the title of this address is one of the first importance to many intelligent deaf people now growing up, and to their friends, and it becomes us who are grown and whose careers are already settled to consider it well for the sake of those who are to follow us. It was much discussed in papers for the deaf last winter and at the last national convention of the deaf.

The matter of the relation of Gallaudet College to technical instruction grows out of the larger one of the importance of preparation for breadwinning by the deaf. This importance can not be overestimated. Herbert Spencer ranks power to earn bread as the first of all aims in education. In a sense it is so. Moreover, of all men, the educated man is the one to whom self-support is most precious; for education, by increasing his sensibilities, increases his distress at the sting and shame and misery of dependence.

The growing interest in technical instruction has also come in part from the fear that teaching as a profession will be closed to the deaf. This fear, while it has grounds, should not be accepted in the light of events. A rigid application of pure oralism is the only thing that would close the career of teaching to the deaf; but there will never be a rigid application of pure oralism in the United States. The people of America have too much common sense for that. Within a few years several schools, and some of them large ones, like Portland and Fordham, have abandoned pure oralism and adopted a combination of methods, while not one American school has ever given up a combination of methods and adopted pure oralism, though all of them have—and wisely—given much more attention to speech teaching. Able men and women among the educated deaf can therefore fairly count upon teaching as one of the careers open to them, though not so open as it once was.

While preparation for breadwinning is of the first importance to the deaf, in a high sense the preservation of Gallaudet College as a college is also of great importance to the best interests of the deaf.

I seek not to justify the existence and perpetuity of the college. There is no need. The work, the character, and the lives of its graduates do that—do it so effectually that in every land on earth where the love of learning and an interest in the deaf exist there the worth of the college is known and shines as a beacon light amid all the world's efforts to lift the deaf. Now, the aim of a college is not primarily to prepare its students for breadwinning. Its aim is to make them completely men. It seeks to develop each student in body, mind, and soul to the highest point of excellence and to send him into the world a master of trained powers and capable of directing his energies efficiently toward any goal. If he must earn his bread, or wishes to pursue any special career, the idea of the college is that he will prepare for it at a university or special school after she has done all in her power to elevate his character and train his forces.

To this high ideal of the office of a college, Gallaudet College must keep true. Anything that tends to degrade her from her rank as a college should be resolutely opposed by all who have the highest interests of the deaf at heart. In this view, Gallaudet College should not teach trades. That would bring her down to the rank of an industrial school, whereas, valuable and necessary as the teaching of handicraft is to the deaf, it is not the province of the college to teach it. It is not her place, for example, to teach the highest of the handicrafts, printing. All such teaching belongs to the field of the schools, and, happily, the schools are doing more and more therein every year. The only question before us therefore is, What should Gallaudet College do regarding technical instruction? and by technical instruction is meant instruction preparatory to making a life work of architecture, engineering, chemistry, and the like. Before trying to answer this question, it is well to state three vital points in the situation:

First. In a college, and therefore in Gallaudet College, compulsory technical instruction is neither wise nor practicable. A college can not, with prophetic insight, as its students come before it, all raw and unformed, say, with a glance at each, you shall be an architect, you an engineer, you a chemist, and so on. No; the secret of success in every technical career is that in the man there lay a decided bent for that career, a natural adaptation for it, and this was coupled with a will which led the possessor to pursue that career with unchanging devotion. A college is powerless to create these tastes and powers in a man, but where they exist she can do much to inspire, to foster, and to guide them.

Second. A true technical course demands superior ability and character. Some have seemed to think that if a student can not master the regular college course he can very well take a technical course. If he fails in the examinations of the regular course he can succeed in those of a scientific course. These views are mistaken. Such a student may do very well in an industrial course, but the fact is it takes just as much and perhaps more mental ability to master a true technical course as to master the regular course. It demands, moreover, strength of will, energy, and character above that demanded in the regular-course student. This is so because the technical student, unlike the general student, has already entered upon the business of his life, and if successful he must devote his student life to his studies with the same earnest, constant, and undivided attention that every successful business man gives to his business; therefore he must often deny himself pleasures, sports, and liberties that the general student may freely enjoy.

Third. A true technical course demands high previous preparation. The successful technical student must have a mind already disciplined and well stored before he begins his technical course. For the deaf, first of all, full command of the English language will be indispensable. Lacking that, the instruction of his text-books and of his teachers to him, as well as his communications to them, will be full of uncertainties in a work whose very lifeblood is certainty. Further yet, look at the catalogue of any recognized technical school and see what it demands for admission. Such a catalogue lies before me, and it says that those who enter must know French or German; for some courses Latin; for all courses algebra, almost complete; geometry, both plane and solid, etc., etc.

One of the speakers at the last national convention thought that it might be best to abolish Gallaudet College and give the money that supports it to pay the tuition of deaf students in technical and agricultural schools for the hearing. Suppose the first part of that proposal carried out; how, then, would the deaf gain entrance to these schools? Money will not buy them entrance; nothing will do that but proof that they possess minds already trained and highly stored. Where will the deaf get this discipline and wealth of preparation? I know of but one place on earth that offers it to them, and that is Gallaudet College.

The third point stated above indicates that almost every deaf student needs all the discipline and all the acquirements of the full college course before he can enter wisely upon a really technical course. For example, Messrs. Hanson and Marr—both now successful architects—graduated from college before entering technical schools. The most recent instance, that of Mr. Picard, is still more emphatic on this head. He is a semi-mute of ability, with perfect command of English, yet he has not only graduated, but also pursued special studies one year in addition in order to enter the Massachusetts School of Technology to better advantage. Certainly, then, at least in exceptional cases can a deaf student wisely enter upon a technical course before the junior or senior year. This does not forbid steady progress toward his chosen aim while still in the regular course. He can read, observe, and note all that bears upon his line of effort in and near the District of Columbia, and can experiment as he has energy and will to do.

Having secured the best preparation that Gallaudet College can give him, what should the deaf student seeking a technical career do next? Without doubt especially if he has some money, he had better enter a technical school for the hearing. These schools are already amply equipped. They have, all united in organizations for definite technical aims, varied courses, full apparatus, and numerous and skilled instructors in every line of work. These are advantages that Gallaudet College has not at present and that it would take years to develop, but even if she had them it would still be best for the deaf student, after preparing at Gallaudet, to enter a technical school for the hearing. Doing so, he will in effect go from the college to the university. He will develop in the latter that special talent for which the former has laid broad and strong foundations. He will, moreover, get into closer relations with that world and those men among whom his future is to be worked out. This, to repeat, is the plan pursued successfully by Hanson and Marr and that promises success in the case of Picard.

Among the students of Gallaudet College, however, there will always be some who, usually for financial reasons, can not obtain a technical education in this best way by entering technical schools for the hearing after preparing in the college. For such Gallaudet College should, can, and will provide technical opportunities.

She should. If she fails to do it, she will fail to meet a very just and necessary demand in one department of higher education, and, so far, she will fail to hold her place at the head of the world's efforts to lift the deaf.

She can. As she stands to-day she is the creation of one man—a monument to his energy, his ability, his character, and his tact. Though he is no longer young in



years, his forces are still vigorous and alert. It can yet be his mission to provide technical opportunities within or through the college that he has made.

She will. This can be doubted least of all. She has promised it. Moreover, there has never been a time when she has not aided a student knowing his own needs in technical lines and having the will and the genius to pursue them. Of this such men as Dougherty and Goldberg and McCarthy are living proofs. And this was never so evident as now. During the year last past two students have studied, quite outside the required college courses, floriculture, two agricultural chemistry, three electrical engineering, and three civil engineering.

But is the organization of a technical department the best way to provide for these few students? No. There is a better way. Such an organization would call for new buildings, diversified and very expensive apparatus, and a new body of instructors—highly educated and skilled men who could command large salaries; in fine, it would amount to the establishment of a new institution. Such a step can be justified and such an institution kept up only by the existence of a large and constant number of trained and capable deaf students eager for technical instruction, whereas the number of such students is small and is likely to remain small for at least a generation to come. The needs of the situation can therefore better be met by taking two steps:

First, arrange the curriculum of the junior and senior years so as to give instruction leading to the degree of bachelor of science and to admission to technical schools for the hearing, opening these courses to students choosing them and who have proved their earnestness and fitness in the previous years; and, second, let the college provide a fund, either from its current receipts or as a new accumulation, this fund to be given as scholarships to such of the fittest among the graduates of these courses as would not otherwise be able to defray their expenses while studying in technical schools for the hearing. For example, five scholarships at \$400 each annually could be provided. This would mean a permanent fund of about \$50,000.

Without at this time going further into the question, I believe that along these lines lies the best way to meet the emergency that confronts the deaf and the college, because, among other reasons, (1) they provide for the technical instruction of every fit deaf student, and provide in the best manner, giving him advantages such as he could not get in any technical school for the deaf, however good; (2) they preserve the integrity of the college, and (3) the burden and expense of this plan would be vastly less than that involved in establishing and maintaining a separate technical organization within the college.

Wherefore, having surveyed the question somewhat widely, and frankly admitted its difficulties, let us not doubt that a wise solution of it is near.

These great steps forward may not be made completely and all at once; they are growths. They should not be made hastily. They should come only in answer to the needs of a steady and growing number of students who have earnest and intelligent aspirations along technical lines. When these appear let us, the deaf at large, have confidence that the Providence and the men who have so largely blessed the deaf in the past will add to their benefactions this one more—wider technical opportunities in and through Gallaudet College.

## C.

### CATALOGUE OF STUDENTS AND PUPILS.

#### IN THE COLLEGE.

##### Alabama:

James W. Sowell.  
Maud H. Brizendine.

##### Arkansas:

Earnest J. Hendricks.  
Eula E. Morriss.  
Charles McRaven.  
John Edward Purdum.

##### California:

Winfield Scott Runde.  
Annie Matilda Lindstrom.  
Frances Amelia Norton.  
Adam S. Hewetson.

##### Colorado:

Ethel Z. Taylor.  
Ethel M. Ritchie.

##### Connecticut:

Deborah H. Marshall.

##### Delaware:

Gertrude Parker.

##### Georgia:

Anna West Allen.

##### Illinois:

Frieda W. Bauman.  
Edith Fitzgerald.  
Frank A. Johnson.

## Illinois—Continued.

Arthur P. Rink.  
Nannie May Moorefield.  
Paul H. Erd.  
Edward H. Garrett.  
Charlotte E. Hall.

## Indiana:

Arthur H. Norris.  
Ernest Mather.  
Julius A. Bente.

## Iowa:

Owen G. Carrell.  
Robert Cook Hemstreet.  
William M. Strong.  
Earle Livingston Appleby.  
Harry G. Long.  
Mamie Lubert.  
Lillie Ward.

## Kansas:

Arthur L. Roberts.

## Kentucky:

Littleton Alva Long.  
Thomas Y. Northern.  
William C. Fugate.  
Otto C. Meunier.  
William G. Wheeler.

## Louisiana:

Daniel C. Picard.  
Grey G. Barham.

## Maryland:

George Schaefer.  
Ezra C. Wyand.  
George Brown.

## Massachusetts:

Ida P. Brooks.

## Michigan:

George W. Andree.  
Roy Carpenter.  
Charles Lawrence.  
William Hunter.  
Clyde Stevens.

## Minnesota:

Gilbert O. Erickson.  
Victor R. Spence.  
Margaret Hauberg.  
Henry Bruns.  
Paul Wys.  
Blanche Hansen.

## Mississippi:

Percy B. Jones.

## Missouri:

Arthur O. Steidemmann.  
Horace B. Waters.  
Peter Hughes.  
Elbert M. Nowell.  
Ivy Myers.  
Howe Phelps.  
Clyde McKern.  
Maude Hagler.

## Nebraska:

Ota B. Crawford.  
Effie J. Goslin.  
Emuna G. Morse.

## New York:

Grace G. Okie.  
Murray Campbell.  
Culmer Barnes.

## New York—Continued.

Anna L. McPhail.  
Winfield E. Marshall.  
John Henry Keiser.  
Emil Mayer.

## North Carolina:

Robert S. Taylor.  
William H. Chambers.  
Robert C. Miller.

## Ohio:

Albertus Wornstaff.  
Cloa G. Lamson.  
Bessie B. McGregor.  
Ida A. Ohlemacher.  
Slava A. Snyder.  
Mary E. Zell.  
Wilhelm F. Schneider.  
John F. Flick.  
Ida Wiedenmeier.  
Harley D. Drake.  
David Friedman.  
John C. Winemiller.

## Pennsylvania:

Emma M. Prager.  
John S. Fisher.  
Daniel E. Moran.  
Samuel Nichols.  
Belle Stout.  
Milton T. Haines.  
Cyril A. Painter.  
Sarah Goldstein.  
Nellie V. Hayden.  
Adelaide L. Postel.  
Guy P. Allen.  
Ernest R. Cowley.  
Scott Foreman.  
Charles N. Snyder.  
George E. Anderson.  
Elmore E. Bernsdorff.  
John L. Friend.  
Elmer S. Havens.  
Howard Judd.  
Joseph L. Kurath.  
Louis P. Schulte.  
Emil D. Straus.  
Grace A. Parkinson.  
George C. Korn.  
Mary Ellen Hfill.

## South Carolina:

Theresa E. Gaillard.  
William John Geilfuss.

## South Dakota:

Marion E. Finch.

## Tennessee:

Lester G. Rosson.

## Texas:

Lettie R. Webster.  
Charles Hunter Cooley.  
Robert Kleberg.

## Utah:

John H. Clark.  
Elizabeth DeLong.  
Lillian Swift.

## Virginia:

Stephen C. Jones.

## Wisconsin:

Duncan A. Cameron.

Fred J. Neesam.

## District of Columbia:

William Lowell.

William Pfunder.

## Canada:

John A. Braithwaite.

Alexander David Swanson.

Margaret Hutchinson.

## Ireland:

Andrew Leitch.

## IN THE KENDALL SCHOOL.

*Females.*

Emily Lucille Bennett, District of Columbia.

Bertha Conaway, Delaware.

Myrtle Estelle Connick, District of Columbia.

Sarah L. Dailey, District of Columbia.

Eva Dorchester, Texas.

Maggie Dougherty, Delaware.

Rosa Early, District of Columbia.

Maud Erlington, District of Columbia.

Mattie Hurd, Delaware.

Tina F. Jones, Delaware.

Carrie King, District of Columbia.

Ida May Littleford, District of Columbia.

Matilda Maddox, District of Columbia.

Mary O'Rourke, Delaware.

Arrenah Pettitt, Louisiana.

Evalyne G. Plumley, Delaware.

Mary Spurry, Delaware.

Sophia Stansbury, District of Columbia.

Carrie Strong, District of Columbia.

Sadie E. Talbert, District of Columbia.

Sadie Torney, District of Columbia.

Maggie Vaughn, District of Columbia.

Rebecca Weil, Georgia.

Viola Weil, Georgia.

Alice Woolford, District of Columbia.

*Males.*

Howard Breeding, Delaware.

Charles Butler, District of Columbia.

*Males—Continued.*

Frank Carroll, District of Columbia.

John F. Caslow, District of Columbia.

Paul Erd, Illinois.

Jacob Eskin, District of Columbia.

Ernest Foskey, Delaware.

Charles Gorman, District of Columbia.

William A. Heagie, Indiana.

Raymond Johnson, District of Columbia.

John Krauer, Georgia.

Aaron Lee, District of Columbia.

Lewis Long, Delaware.

Samuel H. Lynn, Tennessee.

Lester Nailor, District of Columbia.

Arthur Nash, District of Columbia.

Joseph L. Norris, Virginia.

William Pfunder, District of Columbia.

Carl Rhodes, District of Columbia.

George Richardson, District of Columbia.

Joseph P. Riley, District of Columbia.

William J. Riley, District of Columbia.

John Shields, District of Columbia.

George Smith, District of Columbia.

Charles Shepherd, District of Columbia.

Harry Stansbury, District of Columbia.

Arthur L. Swarts, Delaware.

James Thomas, District of Columbia.

Richard T. Thomas, District of Columbia.

Henry Turner, District of Columbia.

Frank Winter, District of Columbia.

William W. Worley, Tennessee.

## REGULATIONS.

I. The academic year is divided into three terms, the first beginning on the Thursday before the last Thursday in September and closing on the 24th of December; the second beginning the 2d of January and closing the last of March; the third beginning the 1st of April and closing the Wednesday before the last Wednesday in June.

II. The vacations are from the 24th of December to the 2d of January, and from the Wednesday before the last Wednesday in June to the Thursday before the last Thursday in September.

III. There are holidays at Thanksgiving, Washington's Birthday, Easter, and Decoration Day.

IV. The pupils may visit their homes during the regular vacations and at the above-named holidays, but at no other time, unless for some special, urgent reason, and then only by permission of the president.

V. The bills for the maintenance and tuition of pupils supported by their friends must be paid semiannually, in advance.

VI. The charge for pay pupils is \$250 each per annum. This sum covers all expenses in the primary department except clothing, and all in the college except clothing and books.

VII. The Government of the United States defrays the expenses of those who reside in the District of Columbia or whose parents are in the Army or Navy, provided they are unable to pay for their education. To students from the States and

Territories who have not the means of defraying all the expenses of the college course the board of directors renders such assistance as circumstances seem to require, as far as the means at its disposal for this object will allow.

VIII. It is expected that the friends of the pupils will provide them with clothing, and it is important that upon entering or returning to the institution they should be supplied with a sufficient amount for an entire year. All clothing should be plainly marked with the owner's name.

IX. All letters concerning pupils or applications for admission should be addressed to the president.

X. The institution is open to visitors during term time on Thursdays only between the hours of 10 a. m. and 3 p. m. Visitors are admitted to chapel services on Sunday afternoons at a quarter past 3 o'clock.

XI. Congress has made provision for the education, at public expense, of the indigent blind of teachable age belonging to the District of Columbia.

Persons desiring to avail themselves of this provision are required by law to make application to the president of this institution.

